

# Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER PROUDHON

Vol. X.—No. 15.

NEW YORK, N. Y., DECEMBER 1, 1894.

Whole No. 301.

*"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!  
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;  
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."*

JOHN HAY.

## On Picket Duty.

The newspapers say that Pentecost is preparing for the stage. In this he should succeed, judging from the way in which he has already played the villain.

Compulsory secular schools have been very aptly defined in England as the "taking of everybody's money to teach nobody's religion."

Miss Frances Willard proposes that a new Cabinet position be created, to be known as the Secretaryship of Amusements. There is no telling what such a secretary would prohibit, but it is to be taken for granted that he would permit Dr. Parkhurst to play leap-frog, and Miss Willard to exhibit herself as a freak in the curio hall of the W. C. T. U. for the delectation of infants engaged in learning to walk.

At last, thanks be unto the followers of Parkhurst, New York city is free from the cruel claws of the Tammany Tiger. To take its place, the free-citizens have taken unto themselves a new bride without cruel claws, although a trifle heavy. The grand old party Elephant is the honored beast who will keep the menagerie going. Does an elephant on the hands recompense for a tiger chased into the bush?

In the early days of suffrage the franchise was regarded as a privilege; by a later theory it was considered a natural right; Belgium has recently made it a duty, enforced by penalties. There is but one step left. After deciding that a man must vote, it would not be more unreasonable to decide for whom he must vote. I suppose that Mrs. Dietrick will look upon woman as a much freer being when, instead of being told that she mustn't vote, she is told that she must.

It is true, as J. Wm. Lloyd says in the concluding sentence of his article in this issue written in temporary defence of the game laws, that partial liberty in the midst of repression is often a hurtful thing. Thus the sudden abolition of custom houses, in advance of the abolition of the money monopoly, would work harm by depriving the country of the use of that portion of the circulating medium which would have to be sent abroad to balance the excess of imports over exports, and which under present banking laws could not be replaced by additional issues based on wealth not now represented by currency. And yet,

despite the importance of the evil that might be thus wrought, I would not for one moment lift a finger in opposition to free trade. My demand for liberty shall be made in the quarter where to me it seems most imperatively needed, but no demand for liberty made elsewhere shall receive other than my encouragement. Nay, every such demand shall be hailed by me as an evidence of progress. It was in this spirit that I reprinted lately an article from the "Orange County Farmer" calling for the abolition of the game laws. It was a note of rebellion sounded from an unexpected quarter, — valuable rather for the attitude taken toward statute law in general than for the special considerations advanced against the laws for the protection of game. But, after all, I cannot see that these special considerations deserve to be described as "thoughtless" and "windy," and Mr. Lloyd's only reason for thinking so ill of the "Orange County Farmer" seems to consist of a feeling of resentment at its refusal to give up its liberty to shoot game today in order that Mr. Lloyd may have the privilege of shooting it tomorrow and that sundry other individuals may dissect it or stuff it or supply the materials and tools necessary therefor. The gratification of Mr. Lloyd in this particular, and of the other persons concerning whom he is anxious, does not strike me as a matter of sufficiently high importance to warrant the taking away from any individual of any legitimate liberty, even pending the arrival of free land; and I say this quite regardless of any opinion that I may entertain concerning the casuistry by which Mr. Lloyd would make it appear that the man who loves to kill, far from being cruel by nature, is rather a beneficent doer of the will of that infinite being who "works in a mysterious way his wonders to perform." Just what will happen to game and forests after free land has been achieved I shall not venture to predict. The problem is a remote one, and is likely to be much affected by the education in social living which man will inevitably receive under those conditions of increasing liberty which will lead up to freedom of the land only after many years. But I apprehend that even in that happy day Mr. Lloyd's Anarchistic forester will not find it an easy matter to collect a fee from the trespasser on ground which he has "marked off" as a game preserve. I would not have him lay the flattering unction to his soul that this world will ever be a sportsman's paradise, even when Anarchy shall prevail.

Mr. Shriver, Single Taxer, remarks that "the American public has shown a great faculty of

late years for switching and flopping, and it may be that they will react to the side of freedom again, to which we thought we had educated them; but it would be folly to deny that the nations stand for protection today." Mr. Stephenson, also Single Taxer, affirms that "it is a fact that the same people who voted two years ago for tariff reduction have now voted for protection by still larger majorities. The protection victory is too widespread to construe the result in any other way. The people have reversed themselves with the greatest agility, and there is no reason to doubt that a large portion of the American people have shown themselves incapable of self-government." My good Single Tax friends, you were very innocent two years ago, very innocent indeed, when you supposed this country had become a free trade country, or even a tariff reform country, all in a minute. You ought to have known then what you are beginning to see now, — that "the mass of voters have no fixed principles, but are mere political weathercocks at the mercy of every wind that blows." And seeing this now, you ought to be able to infer from it the weakness of the Single Tax from the practical side, even were it economically sound. For it depends for success entirely upon the vote, and the lasting support of these same weathercocks. Unless it can get and keep their adherence, it cannot become a fact. Now, the Single Tax idea, be it true or false, is at least a theory reasoned from premises to conclusion, and as such cannot be appreciated by people incapable of grasping fixed principles. It can never win a majority of such people except by accident, some tidal wave of unintelligent rebellion against the existing order; and after this wave, before the Single Tax could have a fair trial, would come one of the flops of which Mr. Shriver speaks, and once more the task of Sisyphus would have to be begun. A permanent tax must, in the nature of things, be sustained by a permanent majority. Viewed from the practical standpoint alone, then, how superior is Anarchism! That needs no votes, and is independent of the weathercocks. It needs only the adherence of a goodly portion of those who can grasp a principle; and this body of adherents, though it constituted but a feeble minority of the nation, — say ten thousand intelligent, resolute men, — could begin and successfully continue the realization of Anarchism, in defiance of law, without voting anybody or anything up or down. Of all the searching reforms now before the world, Anarchism, instead of being the most chimerical, is precisely the most practicable.

# Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Eight Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 130 Liberty Street.  
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., DECEMBER 1, 1894.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all the insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel." — PROUDHON.

The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

## Government Financiering.

The appearance of Uncle Sam in the money market in the role of a borrower is always sure to be highly diverting. The old gentleman is so dense on the subject of finance, and the rascals eager to entrap him are so sharp and bold, that the bargains concluded between such unequal parties cannot be otherwise than droll and absurd.

Uncle Sam is in a hopeless muddle. When his affairs are managed by one set of agents, calling themselves Republicans, he is never short of funds, and, though he spends enormous sums right and left in the most reckless manner, he always has lots of surplus cash in his pockets. There is a drawback, however, and that is the fact that these funds are not earned by those who dispose of them, but are wrung by a system of plunder from millions of overworked men who lack the necessities of the plainest existence. When the cries of the angry and disgusted victims compel Uncle Sam to oust his businesslike managers and entrust his affairs to the other set denominated Democrats, no real improvement is ever secured by the change. The Democrats make a parade of being economical, but they are so inefficient, disorganized, and cowardly that they make a mess of everything. After a long and frantic struggle, they perhaps succeed in reducing to a miserably slight extent the amount of plunder wrung from the people in one definite form, but they invariably make them pay heavily for such a "reform" in other ways, more indirect still.

For some time past, Uncle Sam's outgo has been far in excess of his income. This is the result of the financiering of the Democrats, who reduced his income without knowing how to curtail his expenditure. Something had to be done. Several months ago the old gentleman was obliged to borrow of a few bankers insignificant sum of fifty million dollars.

Interest on this he makes others pay, of course. This stop-gap afforded him some relief for a brief interval, but now he is again in the market, negotiating another loan of fifty

millions. Naturally he expects to be driven to accept more unfavorable terms this time. He will probably have to pay in the shape of interest not less than a sum equal to one-half the principal, and this in a period not longer than ten years. (To be sure, *he* does not pay it, but he regards himself as the loser simply because, if he did not have to pay the interest, he could keep the money for other purposes ministering more directly to his pleasure.)

But all this is by no means the richest part of the matter. The question is not the simple one of eking out a living and borrowing money. Uncle Sam, despite his peculiar unfitness and ignorance, is, among other things, engaged in the business of issuing money. All the money he issues he pledges himself to redeem in coin, which, disinterested persons assure him, means in gold coin. Now, Uncle Sam has \$346,000,000 of old legal tender notes, \$130,000,000 of new Treasury notes, \$200,000,000 of national bank notes, and \$400,000,000 of silver certificates and silver "dollars," which he has solemnly promised to keep at par with gold. Everybody knows, however, that the promise is utterly worthless, since Uncle Sam has only about \$60,000,000 of gold with which to redeem the \$1,100,000,000 of his currency, and since even the little gold he has he can hardly call his, as every day he is called upon to part with a cool million or so in exchange for his notes. The gold held by Uncle Sam is called the reserve, presumably because he has absolutely no means of reserving it. Holders of notes, no matter how much gold they may have, make a point of asking Uncle Sam to supply them with gold for shipment abroad and other commercial uses. To replenish his "reserve" he borrows money, stipulating for payment by the creditors in gold. The creditors, not being fools, agree, after a show of reluctance, knowing full well, in the first place, that in ten years they will get half of it back, and in gold, in the shape of interest, and, in the second place, that there is nothing to hinder them from withdrawing, immediately after the conclusion of the bargain, all the gold paid in by them, and more, by presenting their paper to the Treasury. So that Uncle Sam pays \$25,000,000 for the privilege of replenishing his gold reserve for a few weeks or months.

But even this is not all. Not only do the bankers who supply the gold proceed to draw it out again, but they actually get most of the gold they give Uncle Sam at the latter's own Treasury. They promise to buy his bonds and pay gold, but it takes a few weeks to complete the arrangements, and in the meantime they hurry to the Treasury, present paper or silver, and get gold in exchange. When the time comes for paying over the loan, these patriots, with a flourish of trumpets and waving of flags and banners, return to Uncle Sam his own gold. He receives it, finds himself in no better condition than before, doubts his own sanity and the reality of the surrounding world, and consoles himself by reading the newspaper eulogies of the unselfish bankers. The taxpayer pays the interest and the principal, gets angry, drives Uncle Sam's stupid managers out of office, and installs the Republicans in their places. Then borrowing comes to an end, but up go duties and other forms of robbery.

Uncle Sam's business methods would ruin any other financier, but he is safe for the present. The reason of his safety lies in the folly of the taxpayers. Will they ever wind up his affairs? Y.

## A Glance at the Prospects.

"The Coöperative Commonwealth is coming, and you can't help it," says Laurence Gronlund. And the admiring multitude shouts, "Behold, it cometh!" To the superficial observer this prophecy seems to be amply justified by current events. He sees a decided tendency in that direction, and concludes that State Socialism is almost here. But life is full of tendencies which are not, and never will be, completed, and the tendency towards State Socialism is no stronger than many of these have been.

A few years ago there were but a small number of State Socialists in America. Now they are numbered by thousands. But the more recent converts are of far different material from the older exponents of this school. The latter were men who braved public opinion, sacrificed the much-prized bauble — respectability, and often endangered their chance of making a living in order to have the satisfaction of expressing their Socialistic ideas. But they were so enthusiastic that they were willing to hail everyone as a convert. Let a man express sympathy with some strikers, deplore the greed of capitalists, or lament the existence of slums in our large cities, and the first State Socialist who came along would fall on his neck and call him "comrade." Bellamy's book assisted this kind of propaganda, and it went on rapidly. Thus by degrees the State Socialistic agitation degenerated from a definite movement for the suppression of surplus value by means of State absorption to a sentimental Sunday-school gospel of free rides, free novels, and free lunches. It was live and aggressive; it has become respectable. It is no exaggeration to say that at least fifty per cent. of those who today call themselves State Socialists have no clear idea of what surplus value is or how it is created, and most of the other half are in but very little better mental condition.

How much intelligent action is to be expected from such men? Not much, if we judge by the samples they give us. Their energies are bent on gaining governmental control of monopolies, free coinage of silver, and similar "reforms," which even the consistent State Socialist must consider reactionary. These new converts may be considered as State Socialists with the Socialism left out. Fortunately their ignorance is likely to prove a serious bar to the extent of their mischief. It is liable to disgust the more intelligent members of their school, and to show them the danger of putting full State Socialistic powers into such hands. They may effect a few minor changes, such as those above mentioned, but there their harm must stop, for such reforms will block the way to further developments of State Socialism. And, judging from the history of the Wilson bill, it will be many a long day before even the government control of railroads can be attained. I have such great confidence in the inadequacy of the political method of reform that I hope the *status quo*

will continue until the masses know better that liberty is the one thing needful.

One great danger is to be feared, however. And that is a violent revolution. While agitation is often necessary to stir up discontent, it must be followed by education in order to make this discontent intelligible and serviceable. The agitation that is now being carried on is so extensive, and is reaching such ignorant classes, that the necessary education is left a long way behind. Thus a class of people, who daily see the power of physical force in all their occupations and surroundings, and who are too often incapable of appreciating the power of intellect, is awakening to the social injustice which crushes it to earth. The great question is, can these people be induced to remain peaceful until they can be educated to know what will relieve their distress?

The most unpromising sign is the attitude of the *bourgeoisie*. It seems to be impossible for them to realize that the time has gone by when platitudes, on the one hand, and bayonets on the other, will check the growing discontent. They are unconsciously doing all in their power to precipitate an outbreak, when they might, by conceding a little to public opinion, manage to avert a crisis.

What have we to gain by such a revolution? As soon as it starts, the slums of all our great cities will pour out their population, who will be ready at the first opportunity to repeat the horrors of the Reign of Terror intensified a hundredfold. Should the revolution be successful, either this element will be the predominating factor in the State Socialism which will follow, or else a second Napoleon Bonaparte will arise and institute a rigid system of bureaucracy. If, on the other hand, the revolution should fail, it would establish the present plutocracy more firmly than ever, and every whisper of discontent would be silenced at the point of the bayonet. In any event, we should hear nothing for another fifty years but the praises of the men who saved the Union, and be nauseated with a patriotism beside which our present spread-eagleism would seem insignificant.

F. D. T.

### The State's Babies.

The campaign which made Colorado a Populist State was remarkable for the epithets which the Republicans and Populists exchanged. The Republicans said the Populists were fools; the Populists returned the compliment by calling their opponents knaves. The events that followed justified both, for no sooner had the new party been installed than the kindergarten question came up, and both parties vied with each other in showing solicitude for this new humbug.

The supreme court decided that each school district had the right to establish kindergartens in connection with existing schools, and everybody applauded. The "cry of the children" to be amused most effectually hushed the "still small voice" that tells us to keep our fingers out of our neighbors' pockets.

The arguments for the kindergarten show their *bourgeois* origin. The education of the child must begin early; "the hand and the eye must be trained"; so the child is sent to school at three.

But why should the education begin so early?

Is it to make a finished workman of him: at eight, so that he can be set to work and made to add to the wealth of the community?

The caring for the child by the school district a few hours a day is the first step toward a State nursery where the children will be entirely cared for, thus relieving the parents of the burdens they ought to bear. This would decrease what little prudence the shiftless now possess.

I saw this well demonstrated recently while visiting a kindergarten; one of the smaller children's appearance showed it received very little care. The teacher told me it was "because his mother is insane; besides, she has a baby five weeks old."

The charitable people who imagined they were lessening this poor woman's burdens by opening a kindergarten were mistaken. The more burdens you lift from the backs of the rich (burdens which are rightfully theirs), the more you will have to lift, because these burdens are not a fixed quantity, but are subject to the laws of demand and supply like other things.

Everything that diminishes self-help and individual responsibility delays the coming of the better day.

"Seventy-eight per cent. of the great fortunes of the United States," declared Judge Lyman Trumbull in his address to the Chicago Populists, "are said to be derived from permanent monopoly privileges which ought never to have been granted." You are too conservative, Judge: call it one hundred per cent., and you will still be safe.

Politics makes strange bedfellows, and queer enemies as well. Governor Altgeld, who pardoned Fielden, Schwab, and Neebe, supported in the last campaign Senator Hill, who introduced into the senate a bill to expel them from the country; and, on account of this same bill, Hill was bitterly opposed by Henry George, who helped to murder Spies, Parsons, Engel, and Fischer.

This from Philadelphia "Justice": "The 'first come first served' policy called 'occupation and use' won't settle the question. Justice to the newcomer demands his equal share of the best land there is." As well declare, when the next undersized intellect is born, that justice to the newcomer demands his equal share of the best brains there are, and then clap a tax on brain values. Oh, Equality! how many crimes some good people are ready to commit in thy name!

To readers of Liberty the most interesting literary announcement of the season is that of a new work by Wordsworth Donisthorpe, to be published by Macmillan. "Law in a Free Country" is the title as given by the "Personal Rights Journal," but all the other announcements that I have seen give it as "Law in a Free State." It is to be hoped that the former is the correct wording, for, if not, Mr. Donisthorpe would be guilty of a contradiction to start with. He has declared that a State is necessarily a despotism; now, to talk about "Law in a Free Despotism" would be rather absurd. But, whatever the title may be, the

book itself is sure to be bright, thoughtful, keen, original, and powerfully helpful to liberty.

"Freedom is not an end, but a means," says the Philadelphia "Justice." This is the Single-Tax doctrine. Freedom is not a means, but an end, the State Socialists tell us, though really they believe that it is neither. The Anarchists maintain that freedom is both a means and an end, — an end because it is in itself the chief element in happiness, and a means because by it alone can nearly all the other elements in happiness be obtained. The Single-Taxers ignore the truth that liberty is in itself a blessing. The State Socialists accept it in theory, but override it in practice. The Anarchists proclaim it, and practise it as far as they are permitted to.

Mr. Auberon Herbert allows that we should all be free to make and use our own coinage, but he would have a government coinage in competition with other coinages in order to obviate "the difficulty about contracts." And he asks this question: "unless there is a generally received coinage, how can I contract to pay A B a certain rent for his farm during the next twenty years or receive a certain dividend on shares taken in a company?" Why, that's dead easy, Mr. Herbert. Simply define the terms of your contract in your contract, or else don't ask me to help enforce it for you. People who decline to write their contracts intelligibly must take the consequences. If government were abolished, the tendency of business interests to conform to a common usage would result in the adoption of printed blanks for every ordinary form of contract, in which the term dollar, franc, or pound would be defined, and the cases would be very rare in which these blanks would not be used. Men will agree when it is to their interest to agree, if they are left free to agree. Government is an obstacle rather than a help to coöperation and agreement.

Mrs. Ellen Battelle Dietrick, who writes all that's worth reading in the "Twentieth Century," says in that wreck of a once estimable journal that Liberty refuses to trust woman with freedom because she will only use it to enslave us all. If Mrs. Dietrick here uses the word freedom in the sense of freedom to invade others, I accept her statement of Liberty's attitude as correct. But if she does not so use it (and of course she does not), then I must respectfully request her to cultivate the habit of telling the truth. There is no freedom that I would grant to man which I would refuse to woman, and there is no freedom that I would refuse to either man or woman except the freedom to invade. Whoever has the ballot has the freedom to invade, and whoever wants the ballot wants the freedom to invade. I am not in favor of any discrimination between man and woman in the matter of their respective liberties, and I would abolish all discriminations that now exist. But there are always two ways of abolishing a discrimination. One way is to make two wrongs; the other is to make two rights. My way is the latter; the former is Mrs. Dietrick's. If man had the liberty to steal and woman had it not, Mrs. Dietrick, if she wished to be consistent with



her present policy, would strive to abolish this discrimination by giving woman the liberty to steal. My efforts, on the contrary, would be directed toward depriving man of this liberty. This is precisely the distinction between Mrs. Dietrick's position and mine on the question of woman suffrage, and I hope that now she will understand it.

Mr. George Gillen, of Newark, N. J., who advertises in another column a tiny pamphlet written for the planting of Anarchistic seed, follows the example of Mr. Byington in furnishing cheap tracts for distribution. It is good work.

In printing the last number of *Liberty* a miscount occurred, in consequence of which the edition fell short of the number required. All the subscribers were supplied, but not enough copies remained to fill the sets which are saved for binding. The loss is serious, and it is hoped that subscribers who do not preserve the paper for future use, or who have extra copies to spare, will favor *Liberty* by mailing them to this office, — well wrapped, in order that they may be in good condition for binding. The date of the desired issue is November 17. The same accident made it impossible for me to fill an order for one hundred copies of that issue, received from a subscriber who desired them because of the item in the "Beauties" headed "Police Censorship of the Stage." In order that he may be accommodated, the item is reprinted in the present issue.

### Game and Forests.

*Liberty's* recent reprint of a thoughtful article, "Down with the Game Laws," from the "Orange County Farmer," has revived a once familiar train of thought in my mind. All my life a devotee of the sports of wood and field and a passionate lover of wild Nature the question has often come to me or been brought by others: Had we no game laws, how would our remnant of game be preserved? And what of forests and parks in Anarchy?

For, to adopt this windy advice, "Down with the Game Laws!" with other present conditions unchanged, could have but one result. An army of ruthless boys and pot-hunters would sweep our land with a besom of destruction, and in a handful of years all our game and most of our song-birds would be utterly exterminated to the endless woe of the naturalist, sportsman, taxidermist, and lover of forest joys. A great source of food would be cut off; the plagues of the insect world would devastate the farmer; a multitude of skilled men who find employment in manufacturing and selling sportsmen's goods, dog-training, etc., would be thrown out of employment, and not the slightest benefit would accrue to the animal kingdom. For the natural life of the wild thing is warfare, and his natural death violence. The protection by the sportsman insures a more peaceful life than that of nature, and the lightning stroke of bullet or shot is no worse than to be played with by cat, sucked to death by weasel, dragged by fox, or torn alive by hawk. And to down the game laws cannot save from violence those now alive, and does prevent all life-joys for those whose birth it renders impossible. The "cruelty to animals" boot is on the other leg, and the "sportsman with his murderous gun" the best friend of Nature.

The love of wild Nature and of field sports seems innate in all the Teutonic races, — the most earnest and manly of all, — and the impassioned Celt is hardly behind; and there is no fear in my mind that this trait will ever disappear. To prove, therefore, that the absence of laws will not work ruin to game and forest is to remove from millions of virile and artistic minds a cherished objection to Anarchy.

I am extreme Anarchist in this, — that I believe that in Free Society all formulated laws will give

place to the one great principle of equal liberty which must decide all questions; nevertheless, I believe that without law wild game and singing birds will be more numerous than now, and forests better preserved, and parks larger and more beautiful, and all without taxation or public support.

How?

By and through free land, usufruct, the right of private domain, and the natural operation of the law of demand and supply as related to the love of Nature and the chase.

The present population is thinly and uneconomically distributed by pressure of forced poverty, and because most of the arable land is held out of production by speculative landlords. One of the first results of freedom in land and usufruct will be the withdrawal of the masses from the ungenerous parts of the earth, where they now eke out an uncomfortable subsistence, and their concentration upon the more fertile and tillable lands, where high farming will be carried to Japanese perfection. This will cause a large part of the country, now partly tilled, to revert to Nature.

But there will not be entire desertion. On the contrary, there will always be many so enamored of wild life and pure Nature that residence in the wilderness would be preferred. I suppose that each one of these will proceed to mark off as much of this deserted territory as he can personally attend to, and turn it into a park and game preserve: finding subsistence in lumber culture, nut raising, shooting, trapping, fishing, and in selling to others the right to shoot, fish, trap, and camp on his premises.

It will be for the interest of each one of these foresters to see that his wild stock is not molested in the breeding season, and that destruction is never carried to the point of extermination; in times of drouth, famine, or extreme cold, to provide them food; to see that they are not destroyed by wholesale methods, nor his fish by seines or dynamite; to restore deer, turkeys, swans, pigeons, and other rare American animals to their former habitat; to import and foster foreign beasts and birds; to maintain the natural beauty of every lake, stream, rock, waterfall, tree, or other object, and increase the same by all the arts of forestry, in order that visitors may be attracted and his fees increased.

Obviously, talent and skill in selecting beautiful places, and in developing the natural charms, in breeding and preserving game and singing birds, etc., etc., will bring fame and custom, while usufruct and free competition prevent hurtful monopoly and excessive charges.

And the artistic culture of his wilderness, the frequent intercourse with refined visitors, will prevent the forester from becoming a barbarian.

But outside of forestry the people at large will be conservators. Almost every man will possess land, and it will be easy and natural for each one, no matter how small his holding, to encourage and protect at least the insectivorous and harmless birds. A general public sentiment in favor of birds results at once in their preservation and increase without law. But, even if the masses were indifferent or antagonistic, the foresters would still insure our fauna from extinction and secure its increase.

Every healthy boy is a natural savage, and the greatest present enemy of our birds is that same boy. This is because his sporting instincts have no legitimate outlet. But when, for a trifling sum, he can go a few miles and camp at some mountain or marsh or pine-barren, with the certainty of killing game worthy of his aim and metal, he will despise the slaughter of bluebirds and chippies, as the Western and Southern boys do now.

I claim, then, that in Anarchy, in the most direct and natural manner, all the unproductive and difficult parts of the earth, now held by an overworked and uncomfortable population, will revert almost to Nature and become grand natural parks and game preserves, equal to anything monopoly has created in the old world, and accessible, at cost, to all; a profitable and delightful business will be afforded those whose tastes take them to the wilderness; an abundance of the best game added to the food-supply of our markets; near-at-hand and certain sport provided for those whose vacations take them to the woods and streams; the problem of continued forests and rainfall settled; deer, turkeys, swans, pigeons, bison, returned to haunts

where they have been long unknown; pheasants and foreign game and singing birds successfully introduced; our naturalists relieved of their fear that species may become extinct; and all this without a game-warden, or tax, or appropriation, or legislation of any kind, or any interference with any one's freedom of action.

And that this game, and these parks, would be better cared for than is possible now is obvious to all who reflect that self-interest is always a better spur than official duty.

Just what will be done with our city parks I do not know. Probably a touch of communism will occur here. All those interested in their support will mutually maintain them, and others pay an entrance fee. But, even if they disappear, the loss will not be as now. Cities will not then be such crowded hotbeds, and access to the country will be easier. I fancy there will be less appetite for concrete-walks, cages, and "keep-off-the-grass," and more for wild woods and beasts at large.

The preservation of fish in navigable waters is a harder problem. But manufacturers who poisoned fish by waste chemicals could be made to pay damages to injured fishermen, and the injured public could use the boycott, and the same boycott used against purchase of fish from fishermen using seines and dynamite would be perfectly effective if vigorously applied.

One possible objection deserves attention, — that game would multiply in the forest-parks and escape constantly to the devastation of the farmer. There are two good answers. First, almost all men enjoy shooting, but business pressure and lack of game deter the majority now. With the greater prosperity and leisure, in Anarchy, and the certainty of game in the preserves to attract, there is no doubt but what the increase of sportsmen would balance the increase of game.

Second, it would manifestly be a loss to the forester if his game escaped where it could be shot for nothing, besides exposing to actions for damages; therefore he might be trusted to take the greatest care in fencing, etc., to keep it within bounds, and would himself destroy any dangerous or overflowing surplus.

Let us then "down with the game laws!" but not till land is free, or we may do irremediable injury to science, agriculture, the tribes of Nature and joys of man.

Partial liberty in the midst of repression is often, like other things out of place, a foolish and hurtful thing. J. WM. LLOYD.

### Evils of State Insurance.

An International Congress on Insurance against Accidents was recently held at Milan, at which the subject of compulsory State insurance was discussed at length in the light of Germany's experiments in that line. To Comrade Robinson's anticipation of the evils that would result from a State monopoly of the insurance business new interest is imparted by the following summary of the results of the Milan discussion, made for the London "Times" by Mr. Geoffrey Drage, an English delegate to the congress:

I may first deal with the purely labor point of view. The system of compulsory State accident insurance is intended to limit and decrease the number of accidents. As a matter of fact, the number of accidents in Germany has certainly not decreased. There is every reason to believe that it has seriously increased, and for this statement the figures of the German Imperial Insurance office were cited. Two explanations were given of these figures, — *viz.*, that they were not even yet sufficiently complete or sufficiently detailed, and I may add that it appeared in the course of the discussion that no satisfactory definition or criterion of the term accident had been yet formulated. Further, it was suggested, the increase, if proved, might be due to malingering, which had undoubtedly made great strides. In addition to this, in the course of the debate on culpable negligence, it was elicited that, though the intentions of Herr Boediker, as head of the Imperial Insurance office at Berlin, were as a matter of policy and as a matter of Christian charity, to indemnify the workingman, whether the accident was due to his culpable negligence or not, yet, as a matter

fact, the Imperial Insurance office, by its decisions, strenuously combated such procedure.

It further appeared that, with some workmen at any rate, the presence of State insurance diminished their sense of responsibility, and consequently their care, and this was to some extent the cause of an increase of avoidable accidents.

But there were other objections of a wider character which I may briefly allude to under the following heads: 1, financial; 2, economic; 3, judicial; 4, administrative.

From a financial point of view, it appears that the cost of the insurance schemes has been steadily on the increase, not only from the increase of the number of accidents, but also from the increase of the cost of the administration to the State. It was not possible to obtain from the German representatives any estimate of the burden which was falling on the industries in connection with accident insurance, but one may be permitted to argue that the burden is not inconsiderable or a decreasing one if only from the unanimity of all the Germans who spoke in recommending it to other countries, joined to the fact that it is no longer possible for Germany to retrace her steps.

2. Economically, a grave evil was disclosed in connection with the scheme, which Signor Mazzanti has introduced into Italy, under which it appears that a higher rate is being paid to those suffering from accidents in the sulphur industry than is warranted by the premiums; in other words, a peculiarly dangerous and noxious industry is being subsidized to the detriment of more healthy trades.

3. Judicially, it appears that the increase of litigation has been enormous, and, worst of all, the increase of the appeals to the central office, to which it was thought recourse would rarely be necessary, has been very great. That is, there is all the delay and vexation to the injured person which was to be removed.

4. From an administrative point of view, there seems to be no limit to the wide fields over which ambitious civil servants may extend the dominion of red tape. In the first place, the intention was that the law should be administered locally to a very large extent by the employers and the employed. As a matter of fact, apart from the premiums, the administration is in many cases already a burden too heavy to be borne, and there is an outcry for professional officials.

In the second place, with the increase of such officials, all anxious to prove the excellence of the institutions they serve, there is an increase, not only of the expense, but also of the bureaucratic spirit and power, — an increase, above all, of what is called administrative law, which gives officials peculiar rights and privileges as against the ordinary citizen.

Practically official control will be extended to every part of every branch of industry, and, as it appeared in the course of the debate, Socialists desire to appoint inspectors to see that the agricultural laborer does not catch cold by wetting his feet, or injure his brain or eyesight by exposure to the sun. I called attention in a paper I contributed to the International Congress of Hygiene at Budapest to the necessity of limiting this ever-increasing army of inspectors, to which there now seems to be no end. Of course, in the eyes of all officials, there is nothing like red tape. In Germany this is perhaps a matter of less weight, owing to the existence of a regular class which we might almost call a bureaucratic caste.

### Anarchism in Scotland.

To the Editor of Liberty:

A few words as to our propaganda. Last Sunday we finished our incings at the Glasgow branch of the National Secular Society, and have no cause to regret the efforts we made; indeed, we are proud of the results. I had the first turn and gave a paper in reply to the Glasgow "Herald's" (the leading Scottish daily) leader on Anarchism; next came Comrade Gilbert with a paper on "Individualism: An Exposition and a Defence," and, lastly, Comrade Downie with a lecture on the money question. As the result of our efforts, many of the members have come to us, personally making inquiries and asking all sorts of questions, telling us that they are determined to give the subject the most consideration.

But, while taking this optimistic view of the situation, we have still drawbacks to contend with, — viz.,

lack of financial support and propagandist literature. I am glad to say, however, that Comrade Tarn has authorized us to make use of some literature he left in this city while on one of his visits, and this will certainly be a valuable acquisition. After Comrade Downie had finished his address on "Money," the secretary invited us once more to give subjects for next session's syllabus, which opportunity we gladly accepted. Here is our plan of campaign. Downie will deal with the "Iron Law of Wages," Gilbert with the "Influence of Liberty on Art and Literature," and yours truly with the "Individual and the State."

We have adopted Byington's "target" system, and with marked success. As a proof of this I enclose several letters which have recently appeared in the Glasgow "Evening Citizen." It has the largest circulation of any evening paper in Scotland. But the criticism has been dull.

Industry here has been in a bad state, chiefly owing to the miners' strike, which lasted four months. Their object was to resist a reduction in wages, but they failed.

Here is another matter of importance. At no distant date there is likely to be some agitation for the adoption by the municipality of the Gethenburgh system in the management of liquor shops, or, as we call them here, spirit shops. We attended a meeting on Sunday evening last, and opposed a lecture in favor of it. I saw no halting place between absolute free trade and authority, and tried to impress my audience in favor of the former.

In closing, allow me to say that I will send you at intervals (as circumstances will permit) a letter such as this, giving you a résumé of our work. Let the readers of Liberty know that Scotsmen are on the move.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM GILMOUR.

26 ST. CLAIR STREET, GLASGOW, OCTOBER 30, 1894.

### Mr. Bilgram's Dilemma.

To the Editor of Liberty:

In your issue of November 3 you ask me this question: "Does free competition exist when one competitor has and exercises the power to meet by robbery the deficit arising from the practice of selling below cost?"

My answer is an emphatical "No." But I fail to see the occasion that prompted you to put that question to me.

Yours truly,

HUGO BILGRAM.

[I asked Mr. Bilgram this question because, while favoring a government issue of money, he claims to believe in free competition. I have shown that government, in any business in which it may engage, has the power to sell below cost and to meet by robbery (compulsory taxation) the deficit thus arising, and that it exercises this power whenever it needs or sees fit to. Mr. Bilgram, then, by answering "No" to my question, affirms his own inconsistency, and must as a result declare against free competition or against government banking.—EDITOR LIBERTY.]

### One of G. E. M.'s Gems.

[Truth Seeker.]

The rock in the way of woman suffrage is the adamantine truth that suffrage, male or female, is not a paralyzing success.

### The Cynic's Remedy.

[London Liberty Review.]

"What can we do with our 'fallen sisters'?" was the question of a lawyer who was a leading member of the Social Reform Union.

"Do not pick them up," shot out Diogenes. The humbug slunk away, for he thought Diogenes had found him out.

A little politician sat upon a throne,  
A-whistling to himself a little lay:  
"Never give up chawing while there's meat upon the bone,  
And, if you have a hen, why, let it lay." 17.

### Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, 38 Council Hall, Oberlin, Ohio.

Target, section A. — D. Webster Groh, Breathedsville, Md., a well-known Single-Tax agitator, a strong individualist opponent of prohibition, Sunday laws, etc. Urge him to put in his blows against the government monopolies of money, mails, etc., in which the necessity of government control is so rarely challenged that the State Socialist superstition thinks it has an impregnable stronghold there.

Section B. — A. Freeland, Waco, Texas, a very active Single Taxer, said in an article in the "Single Tax Courier" for August 2:

The Anarchist believes in no government. He is the most extreme individualist. He believes that every man should be a law unto himself. The Socialist would reduce us to slavery, where every man would probably get enough to eat. The Anarchist would return us to the savage state. The Socialists and Anarchists are as far apart as the north and the south poles. They are the two extremes of society. Therefore no one can be a Socialist and an Anarchist at the same time.

Show that Anarchism does not mean savagery, and urge him to study it carefully enough, at least, to know what the Anarchist programme is. Point out the good that Anarchism offers.

Section C. — The "Saturday Globe," Utica, N. Y., had on November 10 an editorial entitled, "Must Rely Upon the Navy," saying that, if America needs any fighting force hereafter, it must be the navy, as our days of land warfare are over. In pointing out the absence of danger on land, it said: "Public sentiment will confine Anarchy to its hiding places, if it does not extirpate it altogether." The editor has often spoken unfairly of Anarchism. Tell him that Anarchism is not dangerous in its teaching, and not so contemptible in strength as not to need a logical answer.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

### We Don't Want You, Little Girls.

Lady Henry Somerset,  
What! do you come back again?  
Are you sure we need you yet  
In this land of sin-and-shame?

Living pictures? Who says so?  
Lady Henry, how you stare!  
You won't stop them here, I know.  
Like you stopped them over there.

In this land of lib-er-ty,  
From the very evening air,  
Freedom's breathed with awful glee  
By the small-boy debonaire.

Please go back to England's shore.  
Take Miss Willard with you, pray.  
Don't come over here no more.  
Go away and stay away.

Take Miss Willard with you sure.  
Don't think that she's not to spare;  
For, though we are very poor,  
Take her there and keep her there.

Don't come over stopping things;  
Living pictures still will rage.  
If your voice much longer rings,  
We will drive you on the stage.

Let us do things on the square.  
This, I think, will surely do.  
While you mind your business there,  
Here we'll mind our business, too.

We'll not stand you, little girls.  
Run away, now, run away.  
We have troubles here in curls,  
And don't want you, anyway.

"The garden of the trees is full of tropical plants, of unexpected flowers; and by no means its slightest charm is this subversion of the natural order, whereby appear at the end of stems and branches fruit just the opposite of that which is promised by the essence of the tree or bush. The apple-tree bears figs, and the cherry-tree medlars; violet-plants yield sweet potatoes, and hollyhocks saffron. It is delicious."  
—SÉVERINE.

### The Beauties of Government.

The readers of *Liberty* are urgently invited to contribute to this department. It is open to any statement of facts which exhibit the State in any phase of its fourfold capacity of fool, meddler, knave, and tyrant. Either original accounts based upon the writer's own knowledge, or apparently reliable accounts clipped from recent publications, are welcome.

#### THE LETTER-CARRYING MONOPOLY

[New York Sun.]

Whenever a foreign ship bearing mails is expected, there gathers a little knot of men in the eastern corridor of the General Post Office. Every man waiting represents some one expectant of an important letter by the ship's mails.

Letters to consignees of cargo come unstamped in the "ship's box," as the phrase is, but the ship may not bring ordinary letters so, and the punishment for the illegal transportation of letters may extend to a year's imprisonment for the offending officer. Outgoing vessels are under like regulations as to the ship's box, but it happens now and then that a tramp steamer, whose hour of sailing is uncertain, may have an enormous batch of letters that never passed through the Post Office. This came to such an abuse that one line was severely admonished touching its rivalry with the Post Office.

When the regulation as to the ship's box is abused, it comes less from a desire to defraud the government than from the wish to avoid any delay that may occur between the docking of a ship and the distribution of the mails. A properly authenticated agent may receive letters from the ship's box as soon as she arrives in port, and thus save perhaps an hour when so much time is exceedingly valuable.

["Defraud the government!" What a topsy-turvy conception of justice is here involved in that phrase! Fancy Grocer Smith complaining that he is defrauded because Jones chooses to buy sugar of Grocer Brown! Fancy also Grocer Smith putting Grocer Brown in jail for a year as a penalty for selling sugar to Jones!]

#### THIS JURY JUDGES THE LAW.

[New York Sun.]

Saloonkeeper Charles S. Delop, of Herkimer street and Vesta avenue, Brooklyn, was tried before a jury in the Gates Avenue Police Court, on a charge of violating the excise law by keeping open and selling on Sunday. Contractor Thomas Reilly swore that he called at the saloon, got a drink, and paid for it, and John Kane corroborated him. Delop swore that Reilly and Kane came in and bothered him about a bill, and that he gave them a drink to get rid of them.

In charging the jury, Justice Quigley said: "You must remember that it is just as much an offence to give away liquor on Sunday as to sell it. If you believe the witnesses of the prosecution, you cannot help but convict. If you believe the testimony of the defendant himself, you have no alternative but conviction."

After deliberating two minutes, the jury brought in a verdict of not guilty.

[Here, through the jury's independence, liberty was upheld, but the case belongs in this department because the result was achieved in defiance of the government's orders.]

#### IN VIOLATION OF THE JUSTICE MONOPOLY.

[Cincinnati Enquirer.]

Peter Hermann, a well-known druggist, living at Glenway and First avenue, had a revolver in his pocket last night, which was seen by a citizen, who notified Officer Berlekamp, and Hermann was arrested for carrying concealed weapons. He stated at Central police station that he was held up not long ago, and carried the weapon for protection.

Police Commissioner Miller recently said that he

would release from the work-house every reputable citizen put there for carrying a revolver. He declared that the Ohio law on the subject is unconstitutional, as the constitution of the United States gives every man a right to bear arms. Mr. Miller is adverse to any reputable citizen being arrested just because he has a revolver, and the outcome of the case will be watched with interest by men who carry such weapons.

[Protection of the person — above all others a matter of individual concern — is held as a monopoly by the State, and with the consent of a certain school of Individualists. If there is anything in the constitution which conflicts with the monopoly, the State will give up the constitution before it will abandon the monopoly. By the way, where does Police Commissioner Miller find it written that the constitution gives the right to bear arms only to "reputable" citizens?]

#### A MAN WITH A MORAL SENSE.

[New York Sun.]

Public opinion in Germany has been defied by the virtual acquittal of one Leist, acting governor of the Cameroons, a German colony in West Africa.

He has converted a peaceful district into a scene of revolt and bloodshed. Several Germans were killed, government buildings were burned, and for some days the life of every white man in the region was in danger. The Germans were able, at last, to assert their authority, and then they promptly put to death the leaders of the revolt, which had been caused solely by the inhumanity and outrageous misconduct of the acting governor.

The German Foreign Office sent Mr. Rose to the Cameroons to investigate the matter. This agent reported that Leist had set all moral principles at defiance; that on the slightest pretexts he had stripped many of the wives of Germany's black soldiers, and flogged them unmercifully with the twisted hippopotamus-hide whip, one of Africa's most potent instruments of torture; that women who were in his charge as hostages had been compelled to dance naked before him. The revolt of the soldiers was wholly due to Leist's abuse of power.

Leist admitted everything, and the only palliation of his offences he could offer was that he was unable to maintain discipline without flogging the women; that, in the eyes of the natives, no special indignity was involved in being stripped naked; and that his immorality did not outrage the moral sense of the people, because they had none. Though he practically pleaded guilty, the court merely ordered his removal to another post and a reduction of twenty per cent. on his salary; and for the past week the German press and public have indignantly demanded that Leist be dismissed from the service.

[The lesson of "evolutionary ethics" to this governor of the Cameroons seems to have been that the ethically undeveloped should minister to the passions of cruelty and sensuality which ethical culture, if one may judge from his case, appears to foster.]

#### IT TAKES A WISE MAN TO TEND A BAR.

[Newcastle Chronicle.]

Sir Peter Edlin, in the strict interpretation of the Licensing Act of 1872, has been forced to affirm, on appeal, the conviction of the landlord of a public house in London for supplying a police constable on duty with liquor. The question of law involved by the circumstances of the case was, however, such, in his opinion, as to warrant its consideration in the High Court. The particular landlord convicted had served, or, rather, his daughter at the bar had served, a sergeant of police who had come into the house, taking off his armband before he entered to make it appear that he was not on duty. The point raised was whether the publican could possibly know if the officer was on duty or not. It seems, however, according to the Act, that the word "knowingly" forms no part of it. Indeed, it has even been held that a licensed victualler could commit an offence in supplying liquor to a drunken man, although he did not

know him to be drunk. Truly, British Acts of Parliament are wonderful samples of wisdom and lucidity.

[It is an old, but unjust, maxim of the courts that ignorance of the law is no excuse. Equally unjust, but new, is the maxim that ignorance of the fact does not exculpate.]

#### STATION-HOUSE AMUSEMENTS.

[New York Evening Post.]

There was arraigned before Justice Burke, in the Harlem police court today, a young man whose face was horribly bruised, whose eyes were closed, and whose clothes were covered with blood. He told a shocking story of police brutality. Policeman Frank D. Converse, of the Twenty-eighth Precinct, who arrested him, admitted having beaten the man because he resisted arrest.

The story the prisoner told the justice was as follows: he described himself as John Robinson, eighteen years old, a silk weaver. He entered the Harlem Hotel, One Hundred and Fifteenth street and Third avenue, kept by John O'Neill, at three o'clock this morning in company with two women and a man. While there, his companions tried to rob him, and he shouted for help. The clerk responded, and called Policeman Converse. The officer told him he did not believe the story of robbery, and ordered him to leave the hotel. His companions had gone. Robinson insisted that he had been robbed. The policeman forced him down stairs and took him to the station-house, beating him on the way. There, he says, the outrage upon him began in earnest. As soon as he had given his name to the sergeant and \$14.40 had been taken from his pockets, he was removed to a back room, where five policemen, who were off duty, amused themselves with him. They took him up bodily and forced his head under a hydrant so as to wash therefrom the blood-stains caused by Policeman Converse's blows. After they had mauled him for some time, he was put into a cell and a cold-water hose turned upon him. The crowd of policemen stood around taking turns playing the hose upon him for fully half an hour. Then he was left in the cell until eight o'clock, when he was taken to court. His clothes were still wet when he was arraigned.

After hearing this story, Justice Burke turned to the policeman and said: "If I could prove these charges, I would make all of you suffer."

The policeman admitted that they had put the man under the hydrant, but said he was not present when the hose was turned on him in the cell. Justice Burke discharged the prisoner, saying that he thought the man had been punished enough. Robinson is a very small man, in fact a mere boy, while Policeman Converse is fully six feet tall and very heavy.

["Punished enough," certainly, but for what?]

#### GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPHY IN ENGLAND.

[London Times.]

To the Editor of the Times:

SIR, — I have had such a curious experience of the vagaries of the telegraphic department of the post office that I am sure your readers will be glad to be warned against what may be in store for each one of them under like circumstances. I hope also that incidentally the publication of this letter may enable me to discover who was the sender of the missing message, — a fact which the department has up to this time failed to make known to me.

On Thursday morning last, the 18th, at about 11.30, a telegram was sent to me here (the British Museum), and, in my absence, was forwarded to an address at Newcastle-on-Tyne which I had left with my official attendant. As I was not expected in Newcastle until the following day (Friday), my hostess, not knowing that I had left London, told the telegraph clerk to return the message to the British Museum. At 3.30 on the same day (Thursday) a messenger called at the Museum to tell my attendant that the message had been returned. On hearing this, my attendant went to the district office, and asked for the message that he might forward it to me by post. He was told, however, that the message was "dead," but that I could have it by applying either there or at Newcastle. This information he communicated to me by letter, and I at once applied at Newcastle for the message.



The reply received was that it could not be given to me, and that the only way I could get it would be by applying to the postmaster-general. This I did by a letter which must have reached the general post office by the first post on Monday morning. In this letter I pointed out that, being a telegram, it was probably urgent, and requested that it might be sent to me at the British Museum at once. On Tuesday morning I received a formal reply, stating that my letter had been received and that it should "receive attention."

As the post-office authorities appeared to think that this letter fittingly represented a full day's inquiry into the matter, I wrote to the secretary expressing surprise at the receipt of such a trifling answer, and reminding him that, as the telegram had been paid for — as a matter of fact it had been paid for twice over, once by the original sender and once by my attendant for its being forwarded to Newcastle — and was in his possession, I begged that it might be sent to me at once.

Up to this moment (4 p. m. Wednesday) I have neither received the telegram nor have I heard from the office. These facts speak for themselves, and your readers will be able to draw their own conclusions as to the administration of the telegraph department. Meanwhile, I trust that the original sender of the telegram may see this, and may be kind enough to repeat the message, and, if I may suggest, to send it this time by post.

I am, sir, yours obediently,

ROBERT K. DOUGLAS.

BRITISH MUSEUM, OCTOBER 24.

[The State, in doing a monopoly business, will never break through its customary procedure to accommodate an individual, or even to right a wrong which it has done him, except in those cases where the individual has a "pull." The bars of a prison cell are less humiliating to its occupant than, to the helpless victim of governmental red tape, are the bars of the grated window which places him at the mercy of an indolent and insolent clerk.]

#### THEY WANT THEIR QUID PRO QUO.

The "Railroad Gazette" has been allowed to peruse the applications for passes received by a railroad company not named. Here are a few specimens, the Mr. X referred to being the superintendent of the road in question:

A legal officer of the railroad says that, when he was arranging for a certain case to come before a certain judge of the Circuit Court, the judge asked if he would not get a pass, which he (the judge) held, changed to include his wife. The lawyer says, "I could not do less than say I would make the request, as we have another case to be brought before him next Wednesday." So the judge's pass was sent to Mr. X "without expressing my opinion of the man." We regret that that judge never had a chance to know what the lawyer and Mr. X thought of him. The judges are perhaps not the worst offenders, but it seems to us particularly odious that they should ask for passes. One who has lost his annual writes for a trip pass. Two others, district judges, ask the local agent to procure trip passes for them. Another one, a circuit judge, asks the deputy United States marshal to do this business for him.

Of course, public officers of high and low degree appear unceasingly in this batch of letters. Governors of States and mayors of cities, councilmen and aldermen, county clerks and sheriffs appear in melancholy monotony. It would take too much room and be too tiresome to brief the letters for members of the houses of representatives and senates of the States, but these gentlemen ask with serene confidence for passes for themselves, their wives, their children, and sometimes for strangers within their gates. One letter is from a prosecuting attorney in a Western State. He says that he had asked for a pass a couple of months before, and had received a printed blank saying "that in accordance with the policy of the company it could not be granted," or something like that. Concerning this he says: "No doubt you are greatly troubled for passes, but to send me a letter like that, with additional words that you would like my cooperation in carrying out this much-needed reform,

and refusing to grant me the pass, is rather presumptuous, for I have daily to grant favors of the law of a great State for your railroad. Your men are all liable to State prosecutions for running trains on Sundays, also for letting trains stop across public streets in towns and cities, and in other ways. You give passes to judges whose salaries are much larger than mine, and my pay depends on the number of successful prosecutions that I procure, as it consists mostly in fees," and more to the same effect. This impudent letter is endorsed "declined," we are glad to see. We fear that few railroad superintendents would have had enough backbone to refuse the request of the roguish prosecuting attorney. The deputy attorney-general of a Western State, who is going to get married, would like a pass for himself and wife, and adds that he will feel under many obligations. This request was declined.

A former speaker of the national house of representatives asks for passes for his wife, his wife's sister, and her cousin. The lieutenant-governor of a State asks for an annual, and says: "In appointing my committees I have favored the railroads, believing that the interests of the State demanded it." A member of the house of representatives of another State asks for an annual, saying that he is aware that the constitution of the State interdicts the granting of passes, but various railroads have given passes to his "legal brothers" as attorneys, so he seems to think that the law can be neatly evaded and the petty fraud committed upon his constituents, and he keep out of jail.

A particularly persistent fellow is the speaker of the house of representatives of a Western State. He has received the superintendent's letter saying that he is not authorized to grant passes to members of the legislature except while the legislature is in session, but he explains that he is the speaker of the house and therefore expects and receives special privileges, and has in fact received annual passes from all the other railroads from which he has asked them. We do not know what his luck was, but, knowing our friend, we suspect that the persistent speaker had to pay his own fare during the vacation.

The chairman of a State political campaign committee modestly asks passes for a period covering the campaign for twenty-one persons, in order that they may make a thorough canvass of the State. He says: "Although the ideas of our party may not fully accord with your own, it is very certain that in the event of success we may be able to do you some substantial favors." A man writes from the hall of representatives of the State, and says that he has done much to defeat bills affecting the road and would like an annual. A member of the house, writing concerning this man, says that he is not a member, but a lobbyist, and that he knows of his having done nothing whatever of any value for the road in question. An official of a State's prison expresses obligation for the superintendent's unexampled generosity in complying with his request for a half-fare pass, and adds, "should it ever fall in my way to do you a favor, I shall certainly improve the opportunity." Mr. X attaches to this letter an elegant woodcut of the prison itself, which doubtless suggested the sort of favor that he might expect. Of course the chief of police asks for a pass, and so does the fire-marshal for himself, and from time to time for various men in the fire department. Why a railroad company should not get police and fire protection without being laid under special tribute, we do not quite see.

[It would be interesting to know any of the legislators here referred to are members of the Lexow committee, which for some months has been engaged in exposing the blackmailing methods of the New York police. "Set a thief to catch a thief."]

#### BOYCOTTING BY TAXATION.

[London Daily News.]

Since the famous Meline tariff of 1892 became the law in France, the commercial relations between that country and Switzerland have been the cause of much vexation on both sides. The Swiss are determined to retaliate by every means in their power. The latest enactment of the federal government is directed against the French newspapers, some of which have a

considerable circulation in French Switzerland. Hitherto these papers have been despatched in bundles by the trains. The moment the new law is put in operation they will no longer be permitted to enter the country in this way. Each copy must pay a small fee of one centime. It is true that a centime is only about a fifth of a half-penny, but the new tax will practically raise the price of French half-penny papers to a penny and of penny papers to three halfpence. A very large number of French papers nowadays belong to the first category, and of these it will be seen the price is to be exactly doubled.

[When individuals act in this way, the States which set them the example punish them for conspiring to injure their neighbors.]

#### POLICE CENSORSHIP OF THE STAGE.

[New York Sun.]

Herr Johann Most and his band of Anarchist actors were not permitted to produce the play "Die Weber" in Newark. It was to have been given in Oertel's Hall in Fifteenth avenue, but, on orders from Police Captain Bergen, the hall was kept closed. When the Most actors arrived and found that they could not play, they put up a big sign saying that the police had unjustly interfered, but that the show would be given at a later date.

Capt. Bergen had the sign taken down, and then Most and his followers went to Zink's Hall, in Bedford street. When the police followed them, the crowd hurriedly left by a rear entrance and came back to this city. Sixty-five mounted and foot policemen kept the several thousand people in the vicinity of Oertel's Hall on the move, and in an hour the streets were clear.

[That Gerhardt Hauptmann's "Weavers," after scoring a brilliant success in Paris, after capturing the entire New York press through an amateur performance in an obscure theatre on the Bowery, and after production in Berlin by the will of the emperor, should now be swept from the boards by a gang of Newark "cops" is indeed an anti-climax.]

#### LETTER POSTAGE TRIPLED.

[S. A. R. in New York Sun.]

Not satisfied with the income tax, the Administration has formed a new plot, the object of which is to increase further the amount of revenue. While the scheme displays ingenuity, it is too much like a tin-flam game to find favor with the long-suffering people. By putting a thin, non-adhesive substance on the back side of the beautiful new sickly red postage stamp, they first save quite a sum on starch. Secondly, as the stamp always comes off the letter in transmission, they collect four cents more, or double postage at the other end. Thus, instead of two cents per letter, as formerly, they now get six cents. This plan, from the number of complaints received at the post office, seems to be highly successful.

#### AN INCONSISTENCY HERE SOMEWHERE.

[New York Sun.]

The French government is taking measures to protect the president from annoyance. A man was arrested on Wednesday because he wanted to give M. Casimir-Perier a package of newspaper cuttings criticising his policy. The offender will be prosecuted on the charge of insulting the head of the State.

[The republican theory is that the president is a servant employed by the people. Republican practice — in France at least — appears to be that, if the employers venture to criticise the way in which their servant does his work, the servant puts them in prison for insulting him. It is very encouraging to see that the downtrodden employee is beginning to assert his dignity. Yet I could wish that the "Sun" had made his action in this case a text for one of its ethical disquisitions regarding the lines that rigidly fix the beginning and the ending of the employee's rights.]

